

Application No. 10/565,598
Amendment dated May 24, 2010
Reply to Office Action of February 3, 2010

REMARKS

**Reconsideration And Allowance
Are Respectfully Requested.**

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 23 and 24 are currently pending. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 5, 6 have been canceled by way of the present amendment. Claims 10-22 and 25 were previously canceled. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants would first like to thank Examiner Karacsony for the courtesies extended during the Interview conducted on May 6, 2010. During the course of this Interview, the objections to the drawings were discussed. In addition, the rejections based upon prior art were discussed. With regard to the drawing objections, the Examiner and Applicants' representative noted inconsistencies between claim 1 and the disclosed embodiment. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to address these inconsistencies. In particular, claim 1 has been amended so as to specify that the second reactive surface presents a capacitive surface impedance (as opposed to the first surface).

With regard to the rejections based upon prior art, the Examiner indicated that limitations relating to the displacement between a conductor and any other conductor would overcome the disclosure of Qui. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 1 so as to

Application No. 10/565,598
Amendment dated May 24, 2010
Reply to Office Action of February 3, 2010

specify that "the displacement between a conductor and any other conductor is no more than $1/10$ of the wavelength of the electromagnetic radiation".

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qui et al. ("Qui") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142036 to Wilhelm et al. ("Wilhelm"). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qui in view of Wilhelm and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0052834 to Sievenpiper et al. ("Sievenpiper"). Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,927,729 to Legay ("Legay") in view of Qui. Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Legay in view of Qui and U.S. Patent No. 6,850,205 to Yamamoto et al. ("Yamamoto"). These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the preceding amendments and the remarks which follow.

As discussed above, Applicants have amended claim 1 so as to specify that the first surface is an equipotential surface and the second surface presents a capacitive surface impedance and is comprised of a lattice array of conductors disposed on a dielectric surface. In addition, claim 1 has been amended so as to specify that the displacement between a conductor and any other conductor is no more than $1/10$ of the wavelength of the electromagnetic radiation. It is Applicants' opinion the cited references, whether taken alone or in

Application No. 10/565,598
Amendment dated May 24, 2010
Reply to Office Action of February 3, 2010

combination, fail to disclose the specific combination of elements set forth in amended claim

1.

With the foregoing in mind, it is Applicants' opinion the outstanding rejections, all of which are based upon Qui, are overcome and Applicants respectfully request the outstanding rejections be withdrawn.

It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested. If it is felt that an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to contact Applicants' representative at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,



Howard N. Flaxman
Registration No. 34,595

WELSH & FLAXMAN LLC
2000 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: (703) 920-1122